
3D

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Potential Adoption of Revised Standards for the Design and Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments

Executive Summary: This item presents for potential adoption by the Commission the revised standards for the design and implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) in California. These standards have been revised in accordance with TPA design policies adopted by the Commission at the August 2014 meeting and in response to feedback received during a field review conducted in October-November 2014.

Policy Question: Are the proposed draft standards consistent with the policies for California teaching performance assessments adopted by the Commission?

Recommended Action: That the Commission determine if it wishes to adopt the revised Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards and/or the revised Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19, with the potential addition of any modifications that may be made by the Commission as a result of discussion at the December 2014 meeting.

Presenter: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

I. Educator Quality

- ◆ Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

December 2014

Potential Adoption of Revised Standards for the Design and Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessments

Introduction

This item presents draft revised quality standards for the design of Teaching Performance Assessments, including standards for model sponsor support for implementation of Commission-approved TPAs, and also presents revised Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 pertaining to the implementation of the teaching performance assessment requirement. These standards have been revised in accordance with TPA design policies adopted by the Commission at the August 2014 meeting, and have undergone a field review by stakeholders in October-November 2014.

Background

At the October 2014 Commission meeting, draft revised standards for the design of teaching performance assessments as well as for Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 were presented for review and discussion. Background information regarding Commission actions prior to October 2014 relating to the revision of these sets of standards is provided in Appendix A.

Update on the Draft Revised Standards and the Revision Process since October 2014

October 2014: The draft revisions were presented to the Commission along with a recommendation that the standards proceed to a field review that would include edits to the standards based on Commission direction. Some of the key changes made by the proposed edits of October 2014 are outlined below. Where a key change was made to reflect the Design Policies, the specific policy addressed is indicated in parentheses. Some changes represent revisions to one or more standards based on what has been learned through implementation of the prior standards and the fact that there are now national TPA models in use within California (revision) and some represent new standards to address the Commission's design policies (new):

- To refocus the entity to whom the standards pertain from the preparation program sponsor (current standards) to the TPA model sponsor (draft revised standards), since developers of TPA models are typically entities other than program sponsors. For example, SCALE is a TPA *model* sponsor; California State University East Bay is a *teacher preparation program* sponsor. (revision)
- To clearly specify that TPA models need to address the effective teaching of English learners and students with special needs in the general education classroom. (new) (addresses Design Policy 3)
- To eliminate unnecessary and/or redundant psychometric requirements within the assessment development and validation processes. (revision) To assure that model sponsors continue to update their models following Commission approval as necessary

and/or in response to Commission requirements or direction. (new) (addresses Design Policy 6)

- To address standard setting for California candidates for models that are national in scope. (new)
- To require model sponsors to provide candidate and program outcomes and related data and reports as specified by the Commission. (new) (addresses Design Policy 6)
- To clarify requirements and qualifications for scorers (new) and for the training, calibration and recalibration of scorers. (new) (addresses Design Policy 5)
- To provide requirements for scoring options (national and/or local) consistent with the adopted design policies in order to provide reliable and consistent scoring within models and for all candidates. (new) (addresses Design Policy 5)
- To require model owners to provide appropriate and ongoing implementation assistance to programs using that model. (new) (addresses Design Policy 6)
- To eliminate standards which are no longer consistent with the adopted design policies and/or no longer relevant to current operational policies for the TPA. (revision)

The prior two Assessment Design Standards were also reorganized into three standards. The two existing standards were revised and a third standard was added, as follows:

- Part A: Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness (revision)
Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness (revision)
- Part B: Standard 3: Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities (new)

A final update proposed by staff at the October 2014 meeting with respect to revising the standards is to change the title of these standards to the “Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) Quality Standards,” as this title is both more descriptive of the type of standards and consistent with how these standards are referred to in the Education Code.

At the end of the month, the draft revised TPA Assessment Quality Standards and the draft revised Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 were put out for an electronic field review by stakeholders.

November 2014: The draft revised Assessment Quality Standards field review for stakeholders to provide input via an online survey closed on November 15, 2014. A total of 39 respondents completed the survey, and the majority of the questions were each responded to by a total of approximately 35-39 individuals.

Summary of Feedback Received from the Survey Pertaining to the Assessment Quality Standards

The discussion below pertains to feedback from the survey relating to the two Assessment Quality standards (Standards 1 and 2) and the single standard pertaining to TPA model sponsor support for implementation of the TPA model (Standard 3). A discussion of the feedback relating to Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 is provided following this section of the agenda item.

Survey Respondents: A total of 39 individuals completed the survey. Slightly more than half (56%) indicated they had a background or expertise in assessment design and development, and the remainder indicated they did not have such a background. The clear majority of respondents indicated they were not sufficiently knowledgeable about the *Joint National Standards for Educational and Psychological Measurement* to know if the proposed TPA standards were consistent with these national standards. It should be noted, when interpreting the results of this survey, that most respondents were not familiar with the national standards that govern the testing industry as a whole, including K-12 assessment as well as educator licensure assessment.

Profile of the 39 Survey Respondents

Affiliation	Number	% of Respondents
CSU	19	48%
UC	1	3%
Private/Independent	17	43%
Non-profit	1	3%
Not stated	1	3%

There were no respondents from the K-12 sector or from a TPA model sponsor. The majority of respondents by occupational group were individuals directly associated with the TPA such as the TPA coordinator for the institution and/or faculty preparing candidates for the TPA model used by their institution or program.

Key Survey Results

The vast majority of those answering (95%) indicated that the draft revised standards as a whole define the important qualities of a teaching performance assessment for California well or very well. Most respondents indicate that the draft standards do address all of the necessary elements.

Most respondents indicated they read standards 1(b) and 1(f) as requiring content specific prompts, rubrics, and assessors. There were several comments regarding the potential difficulty of finding content-specific assessors by program and/or by content area, particularly for lower incidence content areas. Virtually all respondents to the question concerning draft standard 1(c) agreed that the standard required a focus on EL and special needs students in the general education classroom.

Regarding Standard 3 pertaining to model sponsor responsibilities, 54% of respondents to this question indicated no addition or deletions were needed, however, 10 respondents indicated they were not sure or did not know if the standard needed any modification, and 7 indicated the standards did need some modification. The issues raised by the respondents encompassed primarily providing further clarification of the local scoring option and of appropriate and inappropriate support for remediation of candidates who were not successful on the assessment.

Regarding the Assessment Quality Standards as a whole, 62% of the 39 respondents who answered this question indicated that no deletions or additions were needed. 21% of the 39 respondents indicated the standards did need some deletions or additions. One commenter indicated the standards should require all candidates to demonstrate ELD support across all content areas and grade levels, that the TPA model sponsor should be required to provide sample benchmark materials for candidate and program use, and that blind double-scoring should be required for all non-passing TPA submissions. Staff notes that demonstrating appropriate instruction and support for English learner students is already included in TPA task requirements within all models; that a candidate handbook is provided by all TPA models that contains sample materials for candidate information, and that all models double-score candidate responses that receive an initial not-pass determination. Finally, several individuals expressed concern for the involvement of commercial testing companies with the TPA.

Summary of Issues Raised by Survey Respondents in the Open-Ended Questions (pertaining to the Assessment Quality Standards only):

- Is the video component required or optional (addressed in Standard 1(f))
- How should the TPA assess Bilingual Credential candidates (concurrent general education and bilingual authorizations) (see discussion below)
- How are Special Needs students addressed for all candidates/content areas (addressed in Standard 1(d))
- How many retakes should be allowed or required on the TPA (see discussion on TPA Implementation Standards below)
- Should the standards establish a timeline for scoring and reporting (addressed in Standard 2(h))
- Assessors' content match to assessment scored (addressed in Standard 2(c))
- Clarification of the local scoring option (see discussion on TPA Implementation Standards below)
- Fees for the assessment (see discussion below)

Two policy issues raised by respondents relative to the Assessment Quality Standards bear further discussion here. These are:

- *The assessment of bilingual credential candidates within the TPA (i.e., candidates earning concurrent general education and bilingual authorizations).* Candidates presently have two routes to obtaining the bilingual authorization: (1) completion of a bilingual authorization program subsequent to obtaining a base teaching credential, or (2) concurrent with obtaining a base teaching credential. Candidates who obtain a preliminary multiple or single subject credential and then subsequently complete a bilingual authorization program are assessed on the TPA within their base teacher preparation program, but are not assessed for their bilingual pedagogical knowledge and ability within the TPA. Typically the bilingual authorization program would assess the candidate's ability to provide appropriate bilingual pedagogy.

Candidates who are preparing for a general education preliminary credential concurrent with a bilingual authorization are assessed on the TPA and typically complete some portion of their student teaching in a bilingual setting, which would inform their response to the TPA prompts. However, currently-approved TPA models do not include tasks designed for these candidates to demonstrate their bilingual pedagogical knowledge in their dual language classroom setting and student teaching assignment. Programs have struggled to provide an appropriate TPA experience for these candidates but to date, no models have a TPA specifically designed for candidates who use bilingual teaching and bilingual teaching methodology as part of their initial credential preparation.

This is a policy issue for the Commission to consider. If candidates for the concurrent base teaching credential and bilingual authorization are assessed on the TPA, should the TPA models provide a TPA bilingual task experience appropriate for these candidates? Or should assessment of candidate knowledge and readiness to teach in a bilingual setting be assessed by the program through an embedded assessment of some kind? If the Commission decides that bilingual pedagogy should be assessed on the TPA, then TPA model sponsors would need to consider potentially developing tasks that are appropriate to candidates teaching in a bilingual setting who are concurrently obtaining a base general education teaching credential and a bilingual teaching authorization.

- *Fees for the Assessment.* It is important to clarify that the Commission has the authority to charge fees for the licensure assessments required of candidates. Program sponsors also have the authority to charge fees for student assessments for licensure purposes, including the TPA.

Below are the proposed revised TPA Assessment Design Standards, including revisions made as indicated above based on stakeholder survey input. Some of the changes address minor edits to the text for grammatical purposes and/or for clarity; others reorganize and/or reorder existing text to group related content within contiguous Standards, and some revisions represent new Standards or language to address the issues raised during the field review. The proposed changes will be reviewed by the Performance Assessment Task Group during its meeting of December 5, and an update will be provided as necessary should the group recommend further changes or edits.

The table below summarizes the proposed revisions.

Standard	Type of Revision(s)
1(c)	Existing text, reorganized
1(d)	Existing text, reorganized and renumbered
1(e)	Existing text, minor edits and renumbered
1(f)	New Standard
1(g)	Existing text, minor edits and renumbered
1(h)	Existing text, renumbered

Standard	Type of Revision(s)
1(i)	Existing text, renumbered
1(j)	Existing text, renumbered
1(k)	Existing text, renumbered
1(l)	Existing text, renumbered
1(m)	Existing text, renumbered
1(n)	Existing text, reordered and renumbered
1(o)	New Standard
2(c) prior Standard	Text moved to Standard 1(g)
2(e)	Minor edits, text reorganized and renumbered
2(f)	Minor edits
2(g)	Minor edits
2(h)	New language added to existing standard, renumbered
2(i)	Minor edits
3(a)	Minor edits
3(b)	Minor edits
Standards 17-19	No changes proposed pending further discussion and input

Proposed Revised TPA Assessment Design Standards
California Teaching Performance Assessment Quality Standards
(Draft Revised November 2014)

A. Assessment Design Standards

Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

The sponsor* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate's status with respect to mastery of the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment's validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.

** Note: the "model sponsor" refers to the entity that represents the assessment and is responsible to programs using that model and to the Commission. Model sponsors may be a state agency, individual institutions, a consortium of institutions and/or partners, a private entity, and/or combinations of these.*

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

1(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring scales that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated scales measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and scales in the assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and scales.

1(b) The TPA model sponsor must include a focus on content-specific pedagogy within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach the content area(s) authorized by the credential.

1(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring scales so different candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the K-12 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of

candidates who use pedagogical practices that are educationally effective but not explicitly anticipated in the scoring scales.

~~1(d) To assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students,~~ The model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners and students with special needs in the general education classroom to adequately assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students.

~~1(e) In addition, f~~ For Multiple Subject candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs must use local program assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the TPA.

1(f) The model sponsor must include a focus on classroom teaching performance within the TPA, including a video of candidate classroom teaching performance and/or an in-person rubric-based observation of candidate teaching performance. The model sponsor must provide programs that use an in-person observation of candidate teaching performance with a valid observation rubric for this purpose.

~~1(d) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring scales to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serves as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California's K-12 public schools. The model sponsor records the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and scales as needed.~~

~~1(e) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring scales so different candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the K-12 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use pedagogical practices that are educationally effective but not explicitly anticipated in the scoring scales.~~

1 (g) The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The TPA model sponsor must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring processes.

- | 1(hf) The model sponsor develops scoring scales and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents that are not likely to affect student learning.
- | 1(ig) The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor's clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for candidates, preparation programs, the public schools, and K-12 students. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.
- | 1(jh) The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically sensitive, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- | 1(ki) The model sponsor completes basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring scales that show differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.
- | 1(lj) In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities.
- | 1(mk) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.
- | 1(n) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring scales to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and

student population of California's K-12 public schools. The model sponsor records the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and scales as needed.

1(o) The model sponsor must make all TPA materials available to the Commission upon request, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The Commission will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.

Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates assessment design to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment design and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

- 2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.
- 2(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring scales are extensively field tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The model sponsor evaluates the field test results thoroughly and documents the field test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.
- 2(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive program to select and train assessors who will score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring scales. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring scales associated with the task. The model sponsor establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who

successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring scales are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.

~~2(c) The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment.~~

2(d) In conjunction with the provisions of Teacher Preparation Program Standard 19, the model sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.

~~2(e) The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment.~~ The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. ~~All models will include a consistently applied scoring process to assure reliability and validity of scoring, and All models must~~ will include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who are trained and calibrated by the model sponsor, and whose scoring work is facilitated and reviewed by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. The model sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that local scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the model for candidates across the range of programs using local scoring, and informs the Commission where inconsistencies in local scoring outcomes are identified.

2(f) The model sponsor's assessment design includes an appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program, if the program is ~~not doing local scoring using centralized scoring provided by the model sponsor~~. If the program is implementing a local scoring option, the program must provide an appeal process as described above for candidates who do not pass the assessment.

- 2(g) The model sponsor conducting centralized scoring for the program provides results on the TPA to the individual candidate based on performance relative at minimum to the first five domains of the TPEs and/or the specific scoring rubrics that are aligned to the TPEs. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregate data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and/or the first five domains of the TPEs.
- 2(h) The model sponsor ~~follows the timelines agreed upon with~~provides scoring data to each candidate and program using the centralized scoring process provided by the model sponsor within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed TPA responses. ~~model to provide scoring data at the candidate and program levels.~~ The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.
- 2(i) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner ~~and~~ format and timeframe specified by the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the Commission's ongoing accreditation system.

Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities

The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model over time.

Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities

- 3(a) The model sponsor provides technical assistance to programs implementing the model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. Clear implementation procedures and ~~candidate~~ materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the model.
- 3(b) The model sponsor conducting centralized scoring for programs is responsible for providing TPA outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the Commission, as specified by the Commission. The model sponsor supervising/moderating local program scoring may oversee data collection and reporting, or, if the local program chooses to maintain and report its own data, must help the local program collect these data as specified by the Commission.
- 3(c) The model sponsor is responsible for submitting an annual report to the Commission describing, among other data points, the programs served by the model, the number of

candidate submissions scored, the date(s) when the results of the scoring were provided to the preparation programs, and other operational details as specified by the Commission.

- 3(d) The model sponsor is responsible for maintaining the currency of the TPA model, including making appropriate changes to the assessment and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program, candidate, and scoring materials, within two years of notification, as directed by the Commission when necessitated by changes in K-12 standards and/or in teacher preparation standards.

Update on the Draft Revised Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19

The Commission initially reviewed draft changes to Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 at the October 2014 meeting. Key proposed revisions to these standards were summarized as follows:

- Standard 17 revisions clarify the conditions of local scoring consistent with the adopted design policies, consolidate requirements previously distributed across the three standards, and eliminate unnecessarily restrictive requirements to promote program level responsibility for implementation decisions. (addresses Design Policy 5)
- Standard 18 revisions clarify acceptable and non-acceptable candidate support activities. (addresses Design Policy 7)
- Standard 19 revisions remove the responsibility for program determination of assessor qualifications and training, and of scoring reliability responsibilities for programs using scoring provided entirely by the model sponsor. Standard 19 revisions also clarify program responsibilities relative to scoring for programs using the local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. (addresses Design Policy 5)

Summary of Feedback Received from the Survey Regarding Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19

The discussion below pertains to feedback from the survey relating to Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19. Regarding Program Standard 17, 89% of the 39 respondents indicated this standard was sufficiently clear to provide guidance to programs. The majority indicated the scoring options were clear and that the video requirements were also clear. However, there were several comments requesting additional information and clarification about how local scoring would work. There were also several comments regarding the difficulties inherent in video recording within a public school setting, including obtaining informed consent permissions from those in the video, meeting school and district requirements for video recording, and how to address the significant variation in local school and district video policies and permission forms.

Regarding Program Standard 18, survey feedback indicated more than 80% of respondents agreed that both the program requirements and the candidate support guidelines were clear. However, 38% indicated that additional considerations should be identified in the standards. These considerations include further specifying if candidates could assist each other with TPA tasks (i.e., by peer candidate reviewing of candidate responses prior to submission), further

clarifying the boundaries of the allowable support activities such as “asking guiding questions,” and clarifying what “the candidate’s own work” means in practice. Further, respondents indicated a concern for the inappropriate sharing of videos. A respondent questioned whether retaking the assessment meant in practice that the candidate revised the prior materials or started over and submitted a new response, and requested clarification so that all candidates were treated similarly in the assessment as required by statute.

Regarding Program Standard 19, three-fourths of the respondents indicated the requirements for assessors were clear. For the majority of the respondents’ programs, a focus on field experience with English learner and special needs students was considered to be a current program practice. However, for some programs this would represent a minor change in current practice or a major change, depending on the specific program. The respondents’ comments indicated that the standards should address English Language Development across all content areas, that the local scoring option should be further clarified, and that there could be a potential difficulty in finding local scorers qualified in the range of world languages taught in California for programs wanting to use the local scoring option. Finally, one commenter indicated that the repetition of the assessor qualifications in this standard was not necessary since assessor qualifications were addressed in the Assessment Quality Standards. Finally, another commenter indicated that the knowledge, skills, and abilities of assessors with respect to appropriate pedagogical practices for special needs students in the regular education classroom were inadequate.

Overall, the TPA survey results for Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 indicated that program respondents wanted more specific implementation details to guide daily program operation of the TPA. Three of these policy-related implementation topics are discussed in greater depth below.

- *Assessment Retake policy and practices.* Currently programs have been making their own decisions as to how many retakes of the TPA are permitted. The number varies from only one additional attempt to an unlimited number of attempts. For some programs, this is a fiscal issue because each time a candidate retakes the assessment timely scoring services must be provided. On a statewide basis, this may be a candidate equity issue because the variability in number of retakes permitted provides some candidates with more opportunities than others to be successful on an assessment that is required for the credential. Staff notes that all of the Commission’s other licensure assessments required for a credential allow an unlimited number of candidate retakes. These other licensure assessments are paid for by candidate fees.

Further, there is currently no statewide description of what a “retake” consists of. For some programs, a retake consists of having the candidate revise part or parts of the prior submission and resubmit that same revised task for rescoring; for other programs, a retake requires the candidate to redo the task as an entirely new submission. This may also be a candidate equity issue as all candidates are not being treated the same within the assessment process.

- *Candidate remediation: acceptable and unacceptable practices.* There are currently no guidelines for what are acceptable and unacceptable remediation practices for candidates who are not successful on the TPA. There are guidelines, however, within Program Standard 18 for what are acceptable and unacceptable candidate support practices. Currently programs do whatever they choose with respect to how remediation is provided to the candidate, how much remediation the candidate receives, and what types of remediation assistance are provided. This may also be a candidate equity issue.
- *Further clarification of the boundaries of appropriate and inappropriate candidate support (Standard 18).* Survey respondents indicated that what was meant by “the candidate’s own work” and by “asking guiding questions” was not sufficiently clear in practice. In addition, respondents were unsure if allowing candidates to peer review their classroom videos and/or responses and reflections prior to submission for scoring was an acceptable practice.

The issues and questions raised during the field review are complex and will have an impact on the statewide implementation of the TPA. These topics will be discussed with the Commission’s Performance Assessment Task Group at its meeting of December 5, 2014, and staff will provide an update at the December Commission meeting regarding any recommendations from the Task Group regarding changes in Program Standards 17-19.

Proposed Revised Preliminary Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19
(Draft Revised November 2014)

Standard 17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA):
Program Administration Processes

The TPA is implemented according to the requirements of the Commission-approved model selected by the program. One or more individuals responsible for implementing the TPA document the administration processes for all tasks/activities of the applicable TPA model in accordance with the requirements of the selected model. The program consults as needed with the model sponsor where issues of consistency in implementing the model as designed arise. If the program participates in the local scoring approach offered by the model sponsor, the program coordinates with the model sponsor to maintain appropriate records of scorer calibration, recalibration, and scoring record. The program encourages faculty to become scorers. The program provides opportunities for faculty to become knowledgeable about the TPA and the TPA process so that they can appropriately prepare candidates for the assessment and also use TPA data for program improvement purposes.

Required Elements for Standard 17: TPA Program Administration Processes

- 17(a) The program identifies one or more individuals responsible for implementing the chosen TPA model and documents the administration processes for all tasks/activities of the applicable TPA model in accordance with the model's implementation requirements.
- 17(b) If the TPA model requires a video, the program places candidates only in student teaching or intern placements where the candidate is able to video his/her teaching with K-12 students. The program assures that each school or district where the candidate is placed has a video policy in place. The program requires candidates to affirm that the candidate has followed all applicable video policies for the TPA task requiring a video, and maintains records of this affirmation for a full accreditation cycle.
- 17(c) If the program participates in the local scoring approach offered by the model sponsor, the program coordinates with the model sponsor to identify local assessors and assure that the assessors used by the program maintain assessor calibration and recalibration status. The program maintains program level and candidate level TPA data, including but not limited to individual and aggregated results of candidate performance, assessor calibration status, and assessor performance over time. The program documents the use of these data not only for Commission reporting and/or accreditation purposes, but also for program improvement.
- 17(d) The program assures that candidates understand the appropriate use of materials submitted as part of their TPA responses, the appropriate use of their individual performance data, and privacy considerations relating to the use of candidate data.

- 17(e) A program using a local scoring process establishes and consistently uses appropriate measures to ensure the security of all TPA training materials, including all print, online, video, and assessor materials which may be in the program's possession.
- 17 (f) The program using a local scoring process provides and implements an appeal policy for candidates who do not pass the TPA.
- 17(g) All programs have an appeal policy for candidates who have complaints about the program's implementation of the TPA process.

**Standard 18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment:
Candidate Preparation and Support**

The teacher preparation program assures that each candidate receives clear and accurate information about the nature of the pedagogical tasks within the Commission-approved teaching performance assessment model selected by the program, the passing score standard for the assessment, and the opportunities available within the program to prepare for completing the TPA tasks/activities. The program assures that candidates understand that all responses to the TPA submitted for scoring represent the candidate's own work.

- 18(a) The program implements as indicated below the following support activities for candidates:

These activities constitute **required** forms of support for candidates within the TPA process:

- Providing candidates with access to handbooks and other explanatory materials about the TPA and expectations for candidate performance on the assessment
- Explaining TPA tasks and scoring rubrics
- Engaging candidates in formative experiences aligned with a TPA (e.g., assignments analyzing their instruction, developing curriculum units, or assessing student work)

These activities constitute **acceptable, but not required** forms of support for candidates within the TPA process:

- Guiding discussions about the TPA tasks and scoring rubrics
- Providing support documents such as advice on making good choices about what to use within the assessment responses
- Using TPA scoring rubrics on assignments other than the candidate responses submitted for scoring
- Asking probing questions about candidate draft TPA responses, without providing direct edits or specific suggestions about the candidate's work
- Assisting candidates in understanding how to use the electronic platforms for models/programs using electronic uploading of candidate responses
- Arranging technical assistance for the video portion of the assessment.

These activities constitute **unacceptable** forms of support for candidates within the TPA process:

- Editing a candidate's official materials prior to submission
- Providing specific critique of candidate responses that suggests alternative responses, prior to submission for official scoring
- Telling candidates which video clips to select for submission
- Uploading candidate TPA responses (written responses or video entries) on public access social media websites.

18(b) The program provides timely formative feedback information to candidates on their performance on the TPA and relative to their mastery of the domains of the TPEs.

18(c) The program provides opportunities for candidates who are not successful on the assessment to receive remedial assistance with respect to the TPEs, and to retake it. The program only recommends candidates who have met the passing score on the TPA for a preliminary teaching credential.

Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability

The teacher preparation program choosing to implement a local scoring option follows the established selection criteria for that model to select assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA. For a program using centralized scoring conducted by the model sponsor using a national or other than local scoring pool, the model sponsor is responsible for the selection, training, and scoring reliability of assessors.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission determine if it wishes to adopt the revised Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards and/or the revised Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 at this time, with the potential addition of any modifications that may be made by the Commission as a result of discussion at the December 2014 meeting.

Next Steps

If the Commission adopts one or both sets of standards presented in the agenda item, staff would inform the field and begin organizing technical assistance for TPA model sponsors. Technical assistance for preliminary teacher preparation programs to implement revised Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19 would begin after the TPA models have been revised and re-approved by the Commission when it would be clear which models have been revised and resubmitted and what the local scoring options for these models would be.

If the Commission directs staff to revise and/or modify any of the draft standards and return these standards for adoption at the February 2015 meeting, staff will work on implementing the Commission's direction.

Appendix A

Background Information from the October 2014 Commission Meeting

The Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement

Education Code section 44320.2 specifies that “Commencing July 1, 2008, for a program of professional preparation to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259, the program shall include a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and that is congruent with state content and performance standards for pupils adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 60605. In implementing this requirement, institutions or agencies may do the following:

- (1) Voluntarily develop an assessment for approval by the commission. Approval of any locally developed performance assessment shall be based on assessment quality standards adopted by the commission, which shall encourage the use of alternative assessment methods including portfolios of teaching artifacts and practices.”

In implementing this provision of the Education Code, the Commission has adopted a set of Assessment Quality Standards and has to date reviewed and approved three teaching performance assessments in addition to the Commission’s own model (FAST, PACT, and edTPA). The Commission’s Assessment Design Standards are based on the Joint National *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* from the American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education. These standards serve two primary purposes: (1) to specify the psychometric properties and requirements pertaining to the design, development, and validation of a teaching performance assessment that measures the *Teaching Performance Expectations*, and (2) to define the teacher preparation program’s role and responsibility in implementing the teaching performance assessment as designed by the model sponsor and approved by the Commission.

The Commission’s Assessment Design Standards were last reviewed and updated in 2006.

Teaching Performance Assessment Design Policies

Based on California’s extensive history and experience with designing and implementing TPAs, staff raised several issues for Commission discussion at previous Commission meetings concerning the need to update both the Assessment Design Standards and the policies governing the development of future TPAs. At the August 2014 meeting, the Commission adopted new policies to govern the future design and implementation of teaching performance assessments in California (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-2C.pdf>). These policies are as follows:

TPA Design Policies as Adopted by the Commission, August 2014

1. The TPA model is designed to allow candidates to demonstrate that they have mastered the *Teaching Performance Expectations* at the level of a beginning teacher qualified to begin professional practice.
2. All models must include candidate tasks, rubrics, and assessor training materials that incorporate California curriculum standards and frameworks in the relevant content

fields, including the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards, as appropriate to the grade level and content area(s) assessed within the TPA.

3. All models must include a significant focus on addressing both the teaching of English learners and of students with special needs within the assessment. Scoring models and training must ensure that scorers are able to accurately score candidate responses relating to the instruction of English learners and students with special needs in the general education classroom.
4. For Multiple Subject candidates, all models will include assessments of the core elementary content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs must also use local program assessments for history/social science and science if not already included as part of the TPA.
5. All models will include a moderated scoring process to assure reliability and consistency of scoring and will include a local scoring option for each model. All models will specify and justify the qualifications for scorers of that model, including appropriate pedagogical expertise as well as demonstrated ability to score accurately and reliably. All models will explain and provide options for how local faculty may be included within the scoring process. All models will provide training and/or training materials to assist program faculty in becoming familiar with the assessment in order to help prepare candidates for the assessment so that candidates are equitably treated in the assessment, as required by the Assessment Design standards and by statute.
6. All model sponsors must comply with the Commission's revised Assessment Design Standards, which will specify (a) how model sponsors need to support programs using that model; (b) mechanisms and processes for ongoing interaction with the Commission on issues relating to TPA policy and implementation, and (c) the models' responsibility to provide data as specified and as requested by the Commission for reporting purposes and program outcomes purposes.
7. All models and programs will provide candidates with substantive opportunities to learn and practice the knowledge and skills that will be assessed on the TPA. Programs and model sponsors are expected to provide for the appropriate support of candidates as they develop their TPA materials for submission and scoring, consistent with the provisions of Program Implementation Standard 18.

Overview of the Draft Revised Standards and the Revision Process

August 2014: At the August 2014 Commission meeting, staff indicated that if the Commission adopted the design policies as provided in the agenda item, staff would work with a TPA task group to revise and update the Assessment Design Standards to align with these policies and bring back draft revised standards to the Commission for information at the October 2014 meeting.

September 2014: In accordance with Commission direction, staff worked initially with a small group of TPA experts to draft potential revisions of the Assessment Design Standards and Teacher Preparation Program Standards 17-19. The work group had representation from users

of three of the four Commission-approved TPA models (one individual representing FAST was invited but unable at the last moment to participate due to illness).

The work group of TPA experts is indicated below:

Name	Affiliation	TPA Model
Amy Reising	High Tech High School	PACT, CalTPA
Caryl Hodges	Notre Dame de Namur Univ.	CalTPA, PACT
Mick Verdi	CSU San Bernardino	CalTPA
Tine Sloan	UC Santa Barbara	PACT, edTPA
Jean Behrend*	CSU Fresno	FAST

*Unable to attend

At the meeting, the TPA experts discussed each of the Commission's current TPA Assessment Design standards (Appendix A) and the proposed draft revisions presented below in light of the relevant Commission-adopted design policies. The group reached consensus regarding the proposed edits as incorporated in the draft revised standards provided later in this agenda item so that the draft standards could move forward for information at the October Commission meeting and subsequently benefit from input from a wide range of stakeholders via a field review.